U.S. Department of Labor

Office of Administrative Law Judges 1111 20th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036 THE OF THE PARTY O

In the Matter of

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

v. Case No. **84-JTP-18**

COMMUNITY RELATIONS-SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

ALJ LAW LIBRARY

ORDER DISMISSING APPEAL

On September 28, 1984 the Community Relations-Social Development Commission, hereafter CR-SDC, filed an "appeal" from a "final determination" of the Grant Officer which had not yet been made. The reason for this highly unusual step was the provision of the Job Training Partnership Act which repealed the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act and in so doing barred any administrative proceeding not commenced prior to September 30, 1984. It is clear, however, that the filing of an appeal to a Grant Officer is the commencement of an administrative proceeding and that there is no basis for CR-SDC's presumption that "administrative proceeding" refers only to proceedings before the Office of Administrative Law Judges. The attached letter from Steven M. Singer, Regional Administrator for the Employment and Training Administrative, dated October 3, 1984 takes the same position as underlies this Order: namely, that an appeal to a Grant Officer filed before September 30, 1984 is the "commencement of an administrative proceedings." The Administrator would be estopped from asserting the contrary in this proceeding and in the event that any such attempt might be successful, this Order of Dismissal is hereby declared to be without prejudice.

In passing I will not that there never has been and may never be a decision of the Grant Officer in this case which could be the subject of a proper proceeding before this Office since his proposals in the attachment to this Order may result in resolution of this matter without his decision.

ORDER

The appeal of the Community Relations-Social Development Commission in this case is hereby dismissed.

 \cdot It is noted that this case should have been designated as a CETA case and not a JTP case.

CHARLES P. RIPPEY
Administrative Law Judge

Attachments

Dated: 7 NOV 1984 Washington, D.C.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Case Name: DOL v. Community Relations-Social Development

Commission

Case No.: 84-JTP-18

Title of Document: Order Dismissing Appeal

I certify that the above-mentioned document was mailed to the

following parties:

James L. Feldesman, Esq.
Boasberg, Klores, Feldesman
& Tucker
2101 L Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037

Barbara J. Carroll
Acting Chief
Div. of Audit, Closeout &
Appeals Resolution
U.S. Department of Labor
601 D Street, N.W., Rm. 5106
Washington, D.C. 20213

Melvin J. Howard Grant Officer Federal Office Building 230 South Dearborn Street Chicago, IL 60604

David O. Williams Office of the Special Counsel U.S. Department of Labor/ETA 601 D Street, N.W., Rm. 5100 Washington, D.C. 20213

William F. O'Donnell Executive Office for Economic Resource Development 700 West Michigan Street Suite 200 Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

Donald Sykes
Executive Director
Community Relations-Social
Development Commission
161 West Wisconsin Avenue
Suite 7156
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53203

Legal Technician

Mary J. Mountin, Esquire Milwaukee County 700 West Michigan Street Suite 200 Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233

John H. Secaras
Regional Solicitor
Federal Office Building
230 South Dearborn Street
8th Floor
Chicago, IL 60604

Steven M. Singer Regional Administrator U.S. Dept. of Labor/ETA 230 South Dearborn Street Chicago, IL 60604

U.S. Department of Labor

Employment and Training Administration 230 South Dearborn Street Chicago, Illinois 60604

Reply to the Attention of: 5 TGE-F

OCT 03 1984

Honorable Nahum Litt Chief Administrative Law Judge U.S. Department of Labor Vanguard Building, Room 700 1111 20th Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Dear Judge Litt:

An appeal was submitted to your office dated September 28, 1984 on behalf of the Community Relations - Social Development Commission (CR-SDC) of Milwaukee, Wisconsin. The appeal was submitted by Mr. James L. Feldesman who is representing CR-SDC.

It was indicated in the appeal letter that a final determination had not yet been received from the Grant Officer. The appeal was filed due to Mr. Feldesman's opinion that Section 181(e) of the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA) had the effect of barring any CETA related administrative proceeding which was not commenced prior to October 1, 1984.

Mr. Feldesman's appeal to your office appears to be an unnecessary precaution as the appeal to the Grant Officer was received September 18, 1984. The enclosure is the Grant Officer's response to that appeal. The response summarize the issues and outlines a course of action for informal resolution inasmuch as there appeared to be no substantive disagreement between CR-SDC and the Milwaukee County prime sponsor.

In summary, at this time we do not expect to be involved in resolution of this matter as a complaint between CR-SDC and the Milwaukee County CETA prime sponsor. As our correspondence (attached) indicates, the problem here appears simply to be a technical one involving late billing.

Sincerely,

Regional Administrator

Enclosure (1)

ce minuses - Mary

PERSON,

Boasberg, Klores, Feldeaman 6 Tucker Attorneys at Law 2101 L Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20037

Attention: Mr. James L. Feldesman

Dear Mr. Feldesmanr

This letter is in reply to your **correspondence** of September 17, 1984 in which you stated that you were representing the Community Relations-Social Development Commission **(CR-SDC)** in an appeal of a determination issued by the **Mélwaukee** County **CETA** prime sponsor.

Your letter indiaated that CR-SDC did not receive reimbursements which they were **dntitled** to as a subrecipient of the Milwaukee County Prime Sponsor. The claim was made that CR-SDC wae reimbursed for indirect costs for fiscal years 1975 through 1979 based on provisional rates approved by its cognizant federal agency. When final rater (which were higher than the provisional rates) were approved, CR-SDC was not reimbursed for the difference between the rates.

The documents submitted with your correspondence indicated that the Milwaukee County Prima Sponsor did not dispute the claim of CR-SDC but rather felt that the claim should be presented to the Department of Labor. This contention was based on the fact that Milwaukee County had returned all unexpended funds for the pertinent fiscal year6 to the Department of Labor.

If the Prime Sponsor has determined that these are allowable costs for CR-SDC which have not previously been billed, it is permissible to submit a late billing to the Department of Labor. If there is:

(a) adequate documentation presented, and (b) certification that the costs art allowable, unduplicated, and do not exceed | ithu the Prime Sponsor's obligational authority for the individual fiscal years or the maximum administrative cost limits then-applicable, then such costs may be paid. This policy was detailed in numerous issuances including:

Region V CETA Letter No. 83-8 (1/25/83), para. 6.e. and Changes #7 (1/24/84), para. 5, and #9 (4/25/84), para 10;

Athehner

Region V CETA Letter No. 83-11 (3/31/83), Q&A-14 and Change \$3 (7/5/83), Q&A-37.

Itisour recommendation that you discuss this matter further with the Mélwaukee County Prime Sponsor to determine if resolution can be reached through a late billing transaction. We will not begin processing a formal appeal until this avenue is explored.

Any questions you have on this matter may be directed to Mr. Jim Kinney at (312)353-1827.

Sincerely,

MELVIN J. HOWARD

Grant Officer

cc: Milwaukee County

5 TGBF-CC R. WAMBACH:ss 9-24-84